DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 280 292 FL 016 553

AUTHOR	Teitelbaum, Herbert; And Others
TITLE	Changing Schools: The Language Minority Student in the Eighties.
INSTITUTION	Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-87281-312-6
PUB DATE	82
NOTE	57p.; Out of print.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; Change Strategies; *Compliance (Legal); Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Federal Legislation; Instructional Development; Instructional Materials; Language Arts; Language Teachers; *Limited English Speaking; Minority Groups; *Personnel Management; *Program Design; School Districts; Second Language Instruction; *Student Evaluation; Teacher Education; Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS	*Content Area Teaching; Education Assistance Project

ABSTRACT

A monograph for school district personnel and education agencies presents a comprehensive plan to address the legal and administrative complexities of implementation of services for language minority students, particularly in bilingual education programs. The first section sketches federal involvement in bilingual education and related programs and outlines some of the responses from local education agencies. The second section discusses issues faced by providers of technical assistance in overcoming resistance to change. It looks at introducing bilingual education into a district, voluntary and mandated change, technical assistance centers, and the role of the technical assistance provider. Section three outlines and examines substantive options for school districts in program design, teacher training, and evaluation. Program design issues include district-wide bilingual education policy, program fragmentation, language arts instruction programs, entry and exit criteria, and content area instruction. Teacher and training issues include finding appropriate bilingual and English-as-a-second-language staff, bilingual materials, and inservice training program design. Evaluation issues include the potential advantages and problems evaluation poses, types of evaluation, creating effective evaluation, and data analysis and interpretation. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED280292

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CHANGING SCHOOLS: THE LANGUAGE MINORITY STUDENT IN THE EIGHTIES

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G R. Tucker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Herbert Teitelbaum
Richard Hiller
Tracy C. Gray
Victoria Bergin

ISBN 0-87281-312-0

FL 016 553

CAL CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS

2

Changing Schools

THE LANGUAGE MINORITY STUDENT IN THE EIGHTIES

Herbert Teitelbaum
Richard Hiller
Tracy C. Gray
Victoria Bergin

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS :: *Washington, D.C.*

3

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Main entry under title:

Changing schools.

1. Education, Bilingual—United States.
I. Teitelbaum, Herbert. II. Center for Applied Linguistics.
LC3731.C47 1982 371.97'0973 82-14602
ISBN 0-87281-312-6

Copyright 1982 by The Center for Applied Linguistics.
All rights reserved.

Contents

Preface vii
Introduction 3

Background to the Education Assistance Project 5
Bilingual Education—A Brief Look Back 6
The Project's Design 9

Overcoming Resistance to Change 11
Introducing Bilingual Education into a School District 12
Voluntary or Mandated Change 13
Technical Assistance Centers 15
The Technical Assistance Provider—A Misnomer? 17
The Outsider—Pro and Con
A Neutral Informed Stance

Substantive Options for School Districts 22
Program Design 23
District-Wide Policy for Bilingual Education
Fragmentation of Programs
Language Arts Instructional Program
Entry and Exit Criteria
Content Areas
Teachers and Training 30
Appropriate Bilingual Staff
Appropriate English-as-a-Second-Language Staff
Bilingual Materials
In-Service Training
Who Devises and Provides It
Who Participates in It
Implementation Concerns
Teachers Must Teach Themselves
Particular Areas to Be Considered
Evaluation 40
Potential Advantages and Problems
Types of Evaluation
How to Create an Effective Evaluation
Analysis and Interpretation of the Data

Preface

The Education Assistance Project was funded by the Ford Foundation during a decade when school districts were required by the courts and federal agencies to comply with civil rights laws. Enforcement entailed substantial money, time, and effort on the part of the court system, lawyers, and educators to achieve the goal of educational equity. Often, the results in the schools were hardly satisfactory. The Court's mandate was less than wholeheartedly embraced by school districts, and compliance was spotty. This was true also in those districts ordered to serve their large numbers of limited English speaking students, an area of particular interest to the Center for Applied Linguistics.

Convinced that not all school districts require lawsuits to provide quality programs to language minority students, the Center for Applied Linguistics was given a grant to develop an effective educational management approach for offering technical assistance to school districts. A team of experienced and diverse experts, headed by two attorneys well acquainted with issues of compliance, developed a comprehensive plan to address the complexities attendant on the implementation of services for language minority students—particularly those of bilingual programs. The ultimate goal was to codify this in a monograph for school district personnel and education agencies, which would include an overview on the benefits and limits of technical assistance. This monograph is particularly timely given the Reagan Administration efforts to transfer much of the responsibility for educational programs to the states and local educational agencies. As the funds for technical assistance become scarcer, school personnel will have to look within the confines of their own districts for answers to the many questions that arise during the implementation of special programs for language minority students.

To assess the practicality of the Education Assistance Project's management approach to technical assistance, two school districts, decidedly different in ethnic composition, geographic location, and economic foundation, were selected to receive specialized assistance. There was one characteristic in common: Both districts were faced with the problems of meeting the needs of their limited English speaking students. Neither district

has been identified by name in this report because confidentiality was a condition for our working with them, but their identity is basically immaterial to our findings. The characteristics and problems encountered in these two districts are generalizable to almost any district that must change in response to the needs of limited English speaking students. These generalizable issues also make this monograph important reading for school personnel attempting to implement any special program or to be providers of technical assistance to school districts implementing such programs.

A project of this type is only as good as the individuals who contributed to its formulation and completion. Herbert Teitelbaum and Richard J. Hiller, the project directors, have had extensive experience in civil rights litigation and are partners in the New York law firm of Teitelbaum & Hiller, P.C. Victoria Bergin, at present Associate Commissioner of Education for the Texas Educational Agency, provided expertise in the areas of curriculum and administration, with special emphasis on English as a Second Language programs. Tracy Gray, Director of the Office of Language and Public Policy at the Center for Applied Linguistics, was responsible for testing and evaluation. Leann Parker, who served as the project administrator during the first year, is currently studying for her doctorate at the University of California, Berkeley.

Many others contributed their time and knowledge to this project. They include: M. Beatriz Arias, Gary Cziko, Heidi Dulay, Cecilia Freeman, Thomas Dietrich, Roger Shuy, and Rudolph Troike. In addition, G. Richard Tucker and John Hammer of the Center for Applied Linguistics provided much in the way of administrative support and guidance throughout the project.

Many thanks are owed to all of the teachers, students, and administrators who permitted us to examine their schools, foibles and all, in a collaborative effort to develop and put into effect a successful program for language minority students.

Jose Ferrer III, formerly with *Nuestro* and now an editor for *Time* magazine, gave invaluable assistance in editing this manuscript, as did Magna Ravenswater.

And finally, our thanks go to Marjorie Martus of the Ford Foundation, whose participation went beyond that of a funding officer to include guidance, criticism, and encouragement when there was little in sight. She served as the ever-present beacon for this project, and we dedicate this work to her.

H.T.
R.H.
T.C.G.
V.B.

CHANGING SCHOOLS

Introduction

Some school districts will undoubtedly choose—or drift into—a sink-or-swim attitude toward their limited English proficient students. Others will rely on English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) programs to the exclusion of other methods. Yet many will seek to do more for their non-English-speaking students because of state and local pressures, or they will act out of a sense that teaching non-English speakers in English only does not invariably force students to function and succeed in the mainstream culture but instead sometimes prevents it and often delays it. For those districts that do decide to do more for such students by offering bilingual education programs, outside advisors can bring knowledge and experience that will help develop successful programs. The Education Assistance Project, having provided such outside advice, has sought in this report to present its observations and recommendations about how to fulfill this task most effectively in the area of bilingual education.

The detailed concerns of program design, training, and evaluation will tend to command most of the attention of technical assistance providers. But it is important not to lose sight of some larger issues that may in the end be the greatest determinants of program success. Perhaps the most important of these is the voluntarism with which the school district embraces the proposed program change. There are simply too many ways for the district to undermine the program. No outside adviser can hope to overcome such resistance, and so primacy must be given to nurturing and encouraging the district's enthusiasm for the program. A related point—and one that underlies many of this report's recommendations—is that the bilingual program that is not fully integrated into a school district will wither and die, if not while the advisors are present, then surely after they leave.

Finally, and perhaps the most difficult to apply, is the central concept underlying bilingual education. That is that bilingual education ideally is not a response to legal or other pressures. It is instead a response to the pedagogical need for better education of students who lack English language skills. A program that ignores this fact cannot hope to succed no matter how well it is otherwise structured. A program that starts from this premise will always be pointed in the right direction—toward the children.

Background to the Education Assistance Project

Bilingual education is about to enter its second generation. Whether this is to be a time of degeneration or regeneration is yet to be decided. What is clear is that the federal government will no longer use its resources to enforce or endow such programs in any way approaching the manner it has in the past. It is also clear that considerable resistance to and resentment of bilingual education continue in a large segment of the population. At the same time, however, there is little doubt that the nation's public schools will continue to face the task of educating a significant number of students who have little or no command of English.

This section sketches the past federal involvement in bilingual education and related programs, and outlines some of the responses from local educational agencies. The Education Assistance Project's observations and recommendations for providing quality education to limited English proficient students through sound planning and specialized technical assistance tailored to the district, although conceived before the Reagan Administration was elected, emerge as even more appropriate in an era of greater local freedom.

The right of public school students to be educated in a language that they understand has always held an uncertain, not to say alien, place in the galaxy of United States civil rights. Controversy about the desirability, efficacy, and constitutionality of this right has raged without surcease during the past two decades. It is, therefore, not surprising that the Reagan Administration, as part of its general withdrawal from activist civil rights enforcement, has lessened the federal effort to bring bilingual education or related programs to students who do not understand English.

Despite the controversy and the federal retreat, such programs are not necessarily headed for the dustbin. The number of non-English-speaking students entering school continues to be large. What *has* changed is that states and local school boards are now freer than they were to choose how they will meet the needs of these students. Many localities will doubtless want to try the best of what has been learned in recent years, and to do so, they will of necessity seek outside help. Far more than before, advisors will be offering their views without the threatening backup of the federal government. Yet the resistance of inertia and of opposing forces will continue. How can such advisors hope to be effective?

Begun in 1977, the Education Assistance Project was designed to explore

answers to this question. The Project did not presciently anticipate the results of the 1980 election. Rather, its underlying focus was on the process of developing strategies for educational change in the context of bilingual education. Specifically, the Project's designers wanted to learn whether non-coercive outside advisors could bring a desired educational change as effectively as, or more effectively than, the mandate of an outside force. It was hypothesized that school district personnel—supplied with appropriate assistance and specialized resources—could implement changes to serve their students with limited English proficiency and could do so without the disruption, cost, and antagonisms so often generated through coercive intervention by federal agencies or courts. What the Project learned about that hypothesis—through both success and failure—is the focus of this report.

But the Project was not conceived and did not operate in a vacuum. Before turning to the particulars of the Project, it may be helpful to put the Project in context by briefly sketching the recent history of bilingual education and the federal involvement.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION—A BRIEF LOOK BACK

Education has rarely been left to educators. Parents, teachers, students, community leaders, union officials, politicians, lawyers, government officials have all played a role in formulating, and at times implementing, public education policy in the United States. Often competing and conflicting demands have been made on the public school system by each group. Widely disparate views have been held even by persons within the same group—reflecting differences in race, ethnicity, sex, educational level, socioeconomic status, religious beliefs, political views, and other determinants.

The push and shove of such forces had long been commonplace. Then during the mid-1960s, a big new player joined the scrimmage in the schoolyard. In 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed. Before ESEA, the level of federal funding for education was minimal, and federal involvement in the educational policies of the nation's public schools was generally inconsequential. By 1980, a scant decade and a half later, the U.S. had a cabinet-level Secretary of Education, was spending $12 billion yearly on education programs, and was broadly intruding in local education affairs. As federal funding increased, local school administrators had to master new skills and comply with new demands. Available federal monies had to be tapped; funding guidelines had to be met; federal monies had to be used specifically for the purposes for which they were intended; evaluations had to be conducted; reports had to be written and submitted. At the same time, civil rights legislation had been heaping a further set of demands on school officials. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, barring discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin in federally assisted programs, prompted a host of federal requirements that local school districts had to meet.

One area of concern for minority students, which was nestled among these expanding federal obligations, attracted little attention at first. This was the federal mandate requiring affirmative steps to overcome the language barrier and to open instructional programs to the non-English speaking. The federal commitment began with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Then, in 1968, Congress adopted the first federal Bilingual Education Act, commonly known as ESEA Title VII, which provided funding for pilot projects in bilingual education. Also in 1968, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare issued a set of regulations, and in 1970, the Office for Civil Rights filed a memorandum—both of these actions furthered bilingual education. In January 1974, the Supreme Court ruled in *Lau* v. *Nichols* that federally aided school districts were required to address the needs of their non-English-speaking students. When Congress reauthorized the Bilingual Education Act later in 1974, it increased the level of support and declared that it was U.S. policy "to encourage the establishment and operation, where appropriate, of educational policies using bilingual education practices, techniques, and methods."

Bilingual education had a sturdy, if not impregnable, legal base. An escalation of implementation followed. In the summer of 1975, a panel of educators developed the Lau Remedies; the Office for Civil Rights and the Office of Education issued them formally, making the Remedies in effect the minimal federal standards for a program designed to overcome discriminatory practices directed against limited English speaking students. Meanwhile, a few months earlier, OCR had identified 334 school districts that had a disproportionate number of students whose primary or home language was other than English and who were not receiving special assistance. These "Lau districts," as they came to be called, were required to complete and return investigative questionnaires. OCR's enforcement efforts focused on these Lau districts and after further investigation, most, though not all, were found to have committed *Lau* violations. In addition to the 334 Lau districts identified in 1975, most of which were in the Southwest and West, OCR examined *Lau* compliance efforts in Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia. In 1977 and 1978, major agreements were reached with Los Angeles, New York City, and Chicago; these agreements were said to affect more than 1,000,000 limited English proficient students.

OCR's increasing enforcement efforts were also carried out extensively in connection with Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) reviews. A school district that wanted ESAA funds had to make provisions for its limited English speaking students. If OCR found those provisions inadequate, the district became ineligible for ESAA funding. A waiver would be granted if the district submitted and implemented a comprehensive education plan including procedures and programs to safeguard *Lau* rights.

The ultimate sanction for noncompliance with civil rights laws—actual termination of federal funds—was rarely invoked by either HEW or its successor, the Department of Education. Yet the threat of such termination, coupled with the risk of deferral or denial of future funding, served as some

deterrent to noncompliance. Some civil rights supporters contended that OCR enforcement often reflected an overly conciliatory approach that encouraged noncomplying school districts to submit a voluntary *Lau* compliance plan. Too frequently, in this view, OCR gauged compliance by the paper plan submitted rather than by actual implementation of the plan.

But if there was criticism that enforcement was too soft, the far more audible and widespread criticism was that enforcement was overly intrusive and rigid. When the Lau Remedies were first announced in 1975, they quickly became a lightning rod for bilingual education critics who complained that the guidelines mandated only bilingual education and precluded alternative teaching approaches. Although that was not precisely accurate, the pervasive complaint remained: The federal regulations were inflexible and insensitive to local variations and realities. Such criticisms came in doubled decibels because both the general spread of federal intervention and the idea of bilingual education were coming under increased attack.

Many Americans who had supported the principle of integrated schools to assure equal educational opportunity for black students did not view bilingual education in the same light. They saw it not as providing an equal opportunity for the non-English-speaking student but as a force that delayed integration of such students into the U.S. mainstream and promoted separation and fragmentation. As for the issue of federal intervention, the smoldering resentment that had been building since the 1965 entry of the U.S. into local school affairs easily spread to include bilingual education, which was condemned as another example of unwanted meddling that was neither needed nor effective. In 1978 a study by the American Institute for Research (AIR) funded by the Office of Education poured oil on the flames when it concluded that the Title VII bilingual education program had not led to improvement in student performance. Supporters of bilingual education pointed to flaws in the study and, as the debate raged, Congress again considered the issue. Once more it voted to reauthorize Title VII, to reiterate the federal policy commitment, and to increase the level of funding. But the federal pendulum was getting ready to swing back.

In August 1980, after more than a four-year gestation period, the Department of Education published in the *Federal Register* proposed regulations to implement the *Lau* decision. These regulations, the drafters hoped, would improve upon the Lau Remedies and formalize the federal policy on bilingual education. Before the 1980 presidential election, OCR opened regional public hearings on the proposed regulations; the proposals once again brought into sharp relief the divergent views and the intensity of feelings about bilingual education. As the hearings progressed, Congress entered the fray and, shortly after the November election of Ronald Reagan, ruled out the adoption by OCR of the proposed rules for six months. The hearings were suspended and ultimately the proposed regulations were withdrawn. Instead, the Lau Remedies promulgated in 1975 were retained, standards that had been viewed by many as binding, an opinion shared by at least two federal courts. But the Reagan Administration made clear that the guidelines were now to be considered advisory only.

This development was not altogether surprising. The ideological position of the new Administration lent new weight to the consistent opposition of such bodies as the National School Boards Association, the National Association of School Superintendents, and the American Federation of Teachers. A less cohesive political constituency, lobbying primarily through the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE), had been making its own case, but was ultimately drowned out in the new tide.

The effect of these shifting federal waters is likely to be more than an undermining of the Lau Remedies. Federal monies for bilingual education programs, as well as for other forms of support, will almost certainly be drastically reduced, if not eliminated altogether. Enforcement efforts by OCR and the Justice Department will slow, if not come to an abrupt halt. As a result, local and state education agencies will become the keys to the future direction of bilingual education.

This is not a wholly new concern for the state and local agencies. Although the federal mandate prompted the growth and legitimation of bilingual programs, the bulk of such programs nationally has also depended in large measure on the proliferation of state legislation requiring or permitting them. It is improbable that bilingual education will be cut back significantly at the state level with the withdrawal of the federal commitment. Regardless of the views of a particular administration and the changes in the mandates that are issued concerning limited English proficient students, these students will continue to enter the United States and their needs will have to be addressed. Even if bilingual programs were not to expand, the need for technical assistance in the area is likely to continue for many school districts.

Since the late 1960s significant progress has been made in developing and refining bilingual education curricula and materials, language assessment instruments, teacher training programs, evaluation techniques, and program models. It is the rare school district whose personnel has experience and expertise in all of these fields. Moreover, although some school districts may be self-reliant in the area of bilingual education, many school districts continue to require outside help because their experience in this area has been limited. During the past several years professionals involved with bilingual education have learned that **there is no single bilingual education model appropriate for all districts and all students**. It would be wasteful to fail to recognize and take advantage of the expertise developed through their varied experience.

THE PROJECT'S DESIGN

The Education Assistance Project sought to use an interdisciplinary team in noncoercive collaboration with school district personnel. The Project was designed to provide quality education for limited English proficient students through sound, integrated planning and to provide specialized technical assistance to a cooperating school district. The aim was to catalyze educa-

tional change without disrupting unduly the educational process or alienating responsible school officials.

Two school districts were selected—one in a small Southwestern city, the other in an East Coast suburb. Both had large and growing populations of students who could not understand much English. Project team members were selected for their range of experience with students with limited proficiency in English. The team members brought with them expertise in such areas as testing, administration, linguistics, law, teacher training, and curriculum development. The selection of team members was approved by school district officials. One of the central principles of the Project was the tailoring of recommendations to the school district.

During various on-site visits, the project sought information about each district in the following areas: pupils, teachers, support staff, supervisory staff, funding sources, curriculum, previous consultants used, and administration. Project team members observed classes and met with school district administrators, teachers, para-professionals, and community groups. The purposes of these meetings ranged from explaining the project and gathering specific information to eliciting suggestions and discussing possible recommendations. The areas addressed included administration, financing, staff development, program planning, curriculum, language testing, program evaluation, first and second language development, language teaching, identification and classification of students.

At the outset of the Education Assistance Project, a basic assumption was held by all team members: that bilingual education was an education innovation worthy of implementation. This position was not taken in ignorance. We knew that the idea of bilingual education rubs nerves raw and elicits strongly held opinions—from the informed and from the ill-informed alike. But the Project had to take bilingual education, in a sense, as a given. The principal purpose of the Project was to explore strategies for effecting that given educational change. The task was not unlike the one that arose in the post-Sputnik era of the early 1960s; though a debate began then—and ensues—on the wisdom of increasing and changing the scientific curriculum, it fell to some educational experts to design and implement these changes despite the debate. Naturally the debate about bilingual education had its effect on the Project's work. But we must stress that the Project members sought to avoid proselytizing on the question of *whether*, and concentrated instead on the question of *how*.

Overcoming Resistance to Change

Technical assistance providers offer some powerful advantages as agents of change. They arrive with the objectivity of an outsider, are not involved with the district's internal politics, and, most important, have greater expertise in the problem and in the resources available to deal with it. But to be successful, advisors ought not to begin work without being aware of the many limits to and drawbacks of the outsider's role. They will be unfamiliar with local realities, will not be able to offer sustained help, and will have a strong urge to push preconceived ideas. Local officials may have invited the advisors only to provide "paper" compliance to legal or political requirements. And as invited guests, advisors can always be thrown out if they push too hard or if they try to go beyond specified areas.

Because of those inhibiting difficulties, technical assistance providers have to walk a narrow and difficult path if they are to overcome the natural resistance to all change and the special resistance to this particular change. Advisors must be both neutral and advocates. They must fit in with the district's teachers and administrators in order to diminish their "above-it-all" expert status, yet they must avoid becoming allied with the bilingual teachers or any other group so that they can exercise influence across the board. They must try to modify and adjust their plans to accommodate local realities, yet they must press the essentials of their plans if their outside experience is to bring any benefit. Finally, they must sort out what can be changed from those things that are inalterable or unconnected to their charter; at the same time they must seek to go beyond too-narrow limits because bilingual education has broad implications (i.e., language assessment can affect personnel, which in turn is connected to training, which is connected to hiring).

Not surprisingly, *how* to implement a bilingual program presents numerous problems. Some of these problems are unique to bilingual education; some are generic to educational systems and are apt to be encountered by any group attempting to introduce new educational programs. The differences are important when one is trying to discover applicable solutions. There are at least three distinct areas of education experience that may have answers to offer: experience specifically related to bilingual education, experience with innovative educational programs in general, and experience with legally man-

dated changes. Of course, the lines of distinction often do blur so that, for example, a specific curriculum-focused innovation may be uniquely related to bilingual education, but may also warrant solutions based on our increasing knowledge of language learning, reading development, evaluation, teacher training, and other substantive areas. There are aspects of change associated with bilingual education that may seem to be specifically curriculum-focused, but which actually radiate beyond that substantive territory into, say, such ethnic or cultural tensions as the integration of faculty, or the struggle for power by minorities, and the resistance to sharing power by the majority. With that general sense of the varied nature of problems affecting bilingual educational change, we turn now to four specific areas of difficulty and the Project's experiences with them.

INTRODUCING BILINGUAL EDUCATION INTO A SCHOOL DISTRICT

As a rule, educational change is more difficult to initiate and less likely to take root if the history and policies of a school district conflict with the proposed innovation. Often, well-intended innovative programs are undermined because there is little or no effort to accommodate these programs to special conditions in the district or to existing procedures of the educational organization. Accordingly, providers of technical assistance should, to the extent feasible, make the proposed educational innovation fit within the ongoing life of the school district. This may mean that the proposed innovation will have to be modified to match the reality of the school district.

Providers of technical assistance should be aware of this reality "going in." But they should also understand that modifications almost certainly cannot bridge the gap between the desired result and the existing situation. For it is likely that a bilingual program—like desegregation before it—will not be compatible with the existing policies, curriculum, organization, staffing, and other realities of the district.

In many districts, including those served by the Project, the technical assistance provider finds: a shortage of qualified bilingual teachers; a need to recruit bilingual teachers from outside the system rather than retraining teachers already within the system; resistance, if not outright opposition, to bilingual education among school personnel administrators and teachers; opposition within the local community; the perception that bilingual programs require additional expenditures; and monolingual teachers who may view the bilingual teachers as separate and apart, less qualified, and the product only of political clout by minorities and not of a proven need for the educational change. The history of the district typically will be that limited English speaking students were allowed to "sink or swim" or were given the standard-fare remedial education programs offered to underachieving or even handicapped native English speakers. More recently, the district might have provided English as a Second Language (ESL) to limited English speaking students on a part-time, pull-out basis.

Whether the district offers the traditional remedial programs or ESL, either approach is likely to fit comfortably with the history and realities of the school district. They certainly fit more comfortably than does bilingual education. Remedial and ESL programs have been around longer and are accepted as part of the ongoing instructional program of the school district. They do not suggest any deficiencies in the existing program or teachers. They presuppose that the deficiency is with the limited-English student. The language of instruction in these remedial classes is English. Significant changes in personnel are not necessitated. The organization of the remedial instruction does not generally include the option of a full-time program in self-contained classes. Accordingly, there is minimal interference with the traditional operation of the schools except insofar as children are pulled out of regular class for part of a school day.

But these approaches to educational changes, selected in part because they are perceived as consonant with the philosophy and operation of a district, may not be satisfying the educational needs of many limited-English speakers. In this case, where the innovation and the school district tradition are incompatible, the technical assistance provider must be prepared to call for a substantial overhaul in the school district in general, and more specifically in the classrooms, including modification of the philosophy that an English-only curriculum is appropriate for everyone. In a very real sense, then, the technical assistance provider seeking to introduce a bilingual education program must be ready both to modify what he or she will recommend and yet to press hard for a change that at the outset may be at odds with the history and the realities of the district.

VOLUNTARY OR MANDATED CHANGE

The introduction of bilingual education programs to a school district is, in a strict sense, not voluntary in most school districts. Rather, again as with efforts to desegregate, it is more likely than not that bilingual education programs result from a mandate originating outside the school system. This mandate may come from legislation, court order, or regulation.

Broadly speaking, the mandates can be grouped into four categories. First, there are obligations that are expressly incorporated into funding statutes and that require the school district to use the funds in a particular way. Even though the district initiates the request for funding, the "voluntariness" of a district's accepting or embracing the *quid pro quo* conditions attached to the receipt of funds could be said to be different from those changes evolving organically from within the school district. But for its being inextricably coupled to the receipt of needed funds, the change would not have been effected by the district. Second, there are obligations that apply to a district regardless of funding (e.g., the Equal Education Opportunity Act of 1974) or that arise indirectly as a result of the district's receiving federal or state monies (e.g., Civil Rights Act, Title VI, the Lau Guidelines). Third, and somewhat in the nature of a hybrid between the

first two, there are statutes that specifically mandate bilingual education and provide funding for school districts. Many, but not all, of the state statutes mandating bilingual education programs fall into this third category. Fourth, there are those obligations resulting from a court order, often the most dramatic outside agent of change influencing bilingual education policy.

Because most districts contemplating bilingual education are facing one or more of those mandates, the issue of voluntariness may seem irrelevant. In fact, although the goad to action is often a mandate, the attitude toward the required change—the degree to which it is welcomed or resisted—may be the most critical determinant of success. Neither of the two districts observed by the Project was under court order. But both had been found in probable noncompliance with the *Lau* mandate by OCR, and each had submitted compliance plans. Only one of the school districts was situated in a state where bilingual education was required by state law. The two districts actively sought and received federal funds for bilingual programs, and were required, consequently, to spend these monies in specified ways and to comply with Title VI prohibitions against discrimination.

Yet in one of the districts it could be said that bilingual programs actually were "voluntarily" adopted. In that district the impetus initially may have come from the availability of federal (and, indeed, state) monies for bilingual programs, with further prodding provided by OCR. Despite some local resistance within the school system and the community the district embraced the educational change affecting policy, curriculum, staffing, and training. OCR's findings were viewed as prescriptive, not proscriptive; constructive, not coercive.

The other district was a wholly different matter, and its resistance proved impossible to overcome. The content of its resistance is worth examining here in detail. The district's policies were in large measure defined by a state board of education which at that time viewed bilingual education as anathema. The district's local board was concerned about the limited English proficient students but would not commit the district fiscally to implementing bilingual education. Moreover, the concern itself was qualified because the popular perception was that many of the students in need were children of non-taxpayers—either foreign government personnel or unemployed immigrants. Thus spending local monies was resisted because, it was felt, no *quid pro quo* would be forthcoming from the target population. Although federal funds for bilingual programs were applied for and received, this represented a commitment by the local board to federal funds rather than educational change. The board continually questioned the efficacy of bilingual education and chose to devote more energy to the questioning than the answering.

The Superintendent, who expressed some interest in bilingual education, was in a tenuous political position because of the party lines that divided the local board and made his tenure uncertain. Bilingual education was not for him an important enough issue to risk conflict at the board level. His positions were not that of a leader in this area. Rather, he deferred on the issue

and placed bilingual education in the hands of an administrator without experience or commitment to developing an effective program.

Although that administrator was well credentialed and experienced in English as a Second Language, her background could not compensate for the lack of training and experience in bilingual education. Feeling more comfortable with ESL programs and insecure with bilingual education, her energies, interests, and sympathies were disproportionately devoted away from the fledgling bilingual programs. Though she acknowledged that test results showed the ESL program was not working, she developed policies and staffing patterns that perpetuated the imbalance. ESL staff was supported by tax levy funds and were well trained; bilingual staff was supported mainly by federal funds and had little of the requisite skills to teach in a bilingual classroom. The bilingual staff was not only isolated from the other staff, but was isolated from the administrator of their program.

Initially, the bilingual and ESL teachers—who are responsible for the same students—met separately at staff conferences. The Project recommended joint conferences, and the district accepted this suggestion. Nevertheless, the two groups remained divided and at odds on how to educate the students. This division could be perceived not only along lines of bilingual versus ESL; it was drawn on ethnic lines as well. In sum, this was a district where the policies, personnel, and practices were diametrically at odds with introducing educational change in the form of bilingual education. Faced with OCR's potential dissatisfaction, the district was more concerned with paper compliance than with educational change. OCR's demands were to be deferred and delayed, it was hoped, until Washington's policies changed. Indeed, the Project's presence was used by this district to buy time from OCR.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS

The local district's response to innovation and its resistance or voluntary acceptance of required change may, as we have seen, prove crucial to the outcome. But the nature and quality of technical assistance provided is also of importance. There have been various forms of such assistance available for at least a half dozen years. In January 1975, one year after the Supreme Court ruling in *Lau*, the government established nine regional General Assistance Centers to provide technical assistance to state and local educational agencies. These "Lau Centers" were modeled after the Desegregation Assistance Centers set up in the late 1960s to aid school districts grappling with federal agency and court mandates to desegregate. A school district, finding itself in conflict with federal requirements for limited-English students and at odds with OCR, could turn to the Lau Centers to aid them in finding a way out. The U.S. Office of Education, which established the Lau Centers, also established Title VII Technical Assistance Centers. Title VII Centers generally concentrated on collecting, developing, and disseminating materials, identifying resources, and assessing programs.

Although not civil rights enforcement agencies, Lau Centers generally

work with school districts under the scrutiny of OCR. These districts are either under investigation or have been found to be in noncompliance of *Lau*. consequently, the Lau Centers are often viewed as part and parcel of a coercive, federal interventionist mechanism. Beyond the resulting suspicion, a number of difficulties have arisen as a consequence of the Centers' status. Many of these problems can operate to co-opt a Center's function. And such pressures operate in more or less the same way on all technical assistance providers. For one thing, the presence of technical experts may be a result more of the district's desire to document an attempt to comply than genuinely to implement bilingual programs. In such a situation, technical assistance providers have been used to mollify and pacify dissident local community groups as well as to hold government officials at bay. The result is that a Lau plan may be agreed to for compliance purposes but then may not be used for program implementation purposes by the district.

In the school district's course of writing a Lau plan, the Lau Center may be asked for advice on particular components—such as what identification procedures will best determine the primary or home language of students, what language assessment instruments are appropriate, what program placement policies should be enacted, what curriculum materials to use, what teacher qualifications to adopt. But the advice is often sought only to assure the district that OCR will accept the plan—the Center's advice may never be sought in the implementation phase. Furthermore, such Centers are not authorized either to "blow the whistle" on paper programs or to seek to effect policy changes. Lau General Assistance Centers serve at the pleasure and sufferance of a district. The Centers cannot come into a district unless invited and can be asked to leave at any time. A Lau Center that volunteers advice in areas in which its assistance was not sought by the district (even if the advice given is sound and made on the basis of on-site observation or review of documents) may risk alienating the district. This unwelcomed advice may affect future requests for assistance or requests from other districts, which in turn may affect the Lau Center's own prospects for future funding. It is therefore probably the exception for the Centers to question the appropriateness of requests for limited, circumscribed assistance.

The underlying assumption governing this type of technical assistance is that the district does not need help in deciding *what* to do, but rather in *how* to do it. The Lau Center personnel become technicians who service those parts of the district that the district finds to be faulty. They are not systems analysts or policy aides. One Lau Center unapologetically analogized the role of its staff members to commercial salespersons: they have a service that is needed although not always wanted; they have a defined sales area or service area; they establish a primary contact person in the consumer group being served; they make regular, planned service calls whether asked or not; they spend more time with their good customers; and they plan their program well in advance to meet their sales quota or program objectives.

The willingness to provide the technical assistance requested and no more, and certainly never to question the wisdom of the request, in some

locales is reinforced by the existence of competing regional, state, and federal technical assistance centers in the area of bilingual education. This competition may be fueled by the fact that certain technical assistance centers, such as the regional service centers, may have obtained funding to deliver a particular type of technical assistance, and once funded to do so, must provide the assistance to meet the objectives of its own funding sources.

THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDER—A MISNOMER?

It is also true that *technical assistance*, by definition, suggests a limitation on the kind of assistance to be provided. There are many areas where technical assistance persons usually are given no role to play, including selecting the type of educational program to be provided to limited English proficient students, defining the goals and objectives of the program (acquisition of English, maintenance of the first language, introduction of reading skills, preservation of a student's self-esteem), the allocation, solicitation, and development of resources (distributing local tax levy receipts, determining what state and federal funds are to be sought), personnel decisions (qualifications required of teachers, recruiting and hiring policies, competency of program directors), and personnel selection and organization (appointing a program director, a director of research, an in-service training coordinator, consolidating ESL and the bilingual department).

In general, the providers of technical assistance are expected to give guidance only in the "nuts and bolts." Such narrowly focused technical assistance can be appropriate and effective if it responds to a well-defined request or need by a district able to identify that need. If a district, for example, recognizes that its bilingual teachers who are offering ESL instruction have little training in ESL methodology, or in particular techniques designed to elicit more than fragmentary oral responses from students, then technical assistance by a person with classroom ESL experience and some familiarity with the district can prove valuable.

However, a district may not recognize the weak spots in its program. Thus, if these same bilingual teachers are not aware that in the ESL class they and not the students are doing most of the talking in English during the instruction, or that they are eliciting one-word responses from the students, or that they are haphazardly mixing the two languages in the classrooms, it is unlikely that the technical assistance needs will ever be identified. Technical assistance providers have to be alert if they are to be of help in such inadvertently off-limits territory. Similarly, a district that wants a technical assistance provider to focus on a particular issue and not other issues may have to be resisted. Because it is virtually impossible to isolate aspects of any program for technical assistance purposes, a technical assistance person should make clear to the district that issues of language assessment may affect issues of personnel, which may influence issues of training, which may in turn bear on issues of hiring, and so on. The ten-

dency to compartmentalize technical assistance often reflects constraints of time and money, and does not respect the interrelationship among the program's different dimensions. Offering only the limited advice originally asked for may well be a true waste of time and money.

The Outsider—Pro and Con

Although a technical assistance group may be in danger of being limited or co-opted by reality, by its own funding specifications, and by its "invited guest" status, it is important to remember that outside expertise in this area also has many strengths. Even if the Lau Centers are phased out by a retreating federal government, outside technical assistance will probably endure because of its very real **advantages** from the district point of view. These include the following:

1 By virtue of their training, experience, and familiarity with the peculiar problems in establishing bilingual programs where none or few existed before, technical experts can be a valuable resource.
2 The outside technical assistance provider can expose the district to persons, materials, approaches, and other resources not previously tapped.
3 The outside technical assistance provider can help organize an information network for the district and aid district personnel in pooling their own resources with those of other neighboring districts.
4 Depending on the context in which a technical assistance provider is invited into the district, the issues pertaining to limited English speaking students may receive more serious and focused attention.
5 Outside technical assistance can bring a hoped-for objectivity to the district.
6 Persons within the district, even those providing technical assistance, are often aligned or perceived as being aligned with competing factions within the district. By a virtue of being from outside the district and to some degree independent of it, a technical assistance person can more freely raise issues that school district personnel may be reticent or reluctant to mention for fear of repercussions or reprisals.
7 The outside assistance may be available at no cost to the district, which for many districts can be a prime consideration.
8 And as we have seen, for better or worse, outside technical assistance providers can be used to mollify and pacify dissident groups, either teachers or parents, or used to demonstrate to pressure groups, including enforcement authorities, the good faith of the district.

There are **disadvantages**, however, in relying on outside technical assistance providers:

1 They are often unfamiliar with the practices, personnel, procedures, and politics of the district.

2 The assistance provided is not sustained.
3 Because they have little or no firsthand knowledge of the district, they are reluctant to offer recommendations that may be perceived as affecting policy or that focus on concerns other than those for which they are specifically brought into the district.
4 To compensate for their lack of familiarity with the particulars of the district, they are apt to rely on preconceived general solutions, which may be inappropriate in the particular case.

When bilingual education emerged as a demonstration project, there were relatively few people in education who had experience in this particular area. As a result, districts had no choice but to rely on the expertise of outsiders. Today, there is a greater likelihood that a district can employ a mix of outside technical assistance providers and district personnel to address the educational needs of limited-English students. In using a mix, a district can maximize the benefits of the outside technical assistance persons, while avoiding the usual concomitant drawbacks. If the opportunity presents itself, the technical assistance provider should work in conjunction with as many "in-house" personnel as possible.

In doing so, it is important for any technical assistance provider to distinguish between those aspects of a school district that are manipulable or changeable and those that are inalterable. This assessment can be made, in part, from discussions with policy makers in the district, including the superintendent, the superintendent's staff and members of the school board, and by reviewing the history of the district. Once those aspects of a district that are amenable to change are identified, the technical assistance provider can begin to focus attention on making those changes that are most important.

A related problem is the likelihood of being viewed as a sounding board for complaints that are deeply felt but are clearly time-worn and outside the competence of the technical assistance provider. Project members at the two districts served were frequently asked to "do something about" the transferring of principals from one school to another, the overcrowding of classrooms, heterogeneous groupings, the mainstreaming of handicapped students, insufficient preparatory periods, lay-offs, and the like. The technical assistance provider cannot dismiss these very real concerns, which affect the daily professional lives of the teaching staff. Yet he or she must be able to sift out those concerns that are so institutionalized that an outside technical assistance provider can rarely affect them.

A Neutral, Informed Stance

The necessity and advisability of working with district personnel presents a critical need for the technical assistance provider: the ability to strike a balance between being neutral and being an advocate. As we have discussed, there will almost certainly be skepticism or hostility toward bilingual programs in a school district. This skepticism and the reasons underlying it

should be anticipated and prepared for. Evidence from and examples of successful bilingual programs should be at hand. Unlike those providing technical assistance in other areas where it is "requested" by the schools, those providing technical assistance in the area of bilingual education are more likely to be asked to "justify" not only the narrow assistance they are providing but also the wisdom of bilingual education in general. The provider must anticipate the many arguments that teachers and administrators throughout the country commonly raise. These are usually offered as reasons why bilingual programs will never be successfully implemented; they include inadequate funds, insufficient teachers, problems in the grouping and clustering of students, in identification of the primary or home language, the shortcomings of the language assessment procedures, and others.

As a result of the debate and controversy surrounding bilingual education, it must be acknowledged that a technical assistance provider, despite efforts to the contrary, will never be perceived as completely objective on the broad issue of bilingual education. Therefore, if the technical assistance provider is to receive essential cooperation from district officials, and assess critical information from these officials, it is doubly important to rise above any conflicts or divisions on the narrower issues within the district. To the extent technical assistance providers avoid "taking sides," their input will have a greater credibility and more chance for implementation. As judges have reason to know, the appearance of impartiality is just as important as impartiality in fact.

Although the Project members gave notice that they worked in a variety of ways in favor of bilingual education, each member refrained from becoming allied with the several factions in each school district that were organized around the issue of bilingual education. Project members were often requested to espouse the position of one group or another. In the school district where the bilingual staff felt isolated and under siege, and where they were essentially powerless within the district and without effectively organized support outside the district, it was especially tempting for Project members to aid them. But to take up their "cause" would have fatally compromised the Project's potential effectiveness, and detracted from the force of its ultimate recommendations.

A theme that recurs throughout this report deserves particular mention here. **It is crucial that bilingual programs be implemented so as to become an integral part of the district's overall program.** Too often bilingual programs are designed and/or implemented so that they operate separately and apart from the district's basic program. When this happens, the bilingual program will not engender the district's commitment—fiscal, personnel, or otherwise. To avoid isolation of the bilingual program, a technical assistance person will have to work with and receive the cooperation of persons who may not be convinced of the program's efficacy or wisdom. Curriculum specialists of the district, the evaluation unit, and the heads of various subject area departments are essential in implementing a program

that is consistent with and takes advantage of the district's overall goals and resources. These people are less likely to join forces with an outsider who appears to represent the position of an advocacy group in the district.

Substantive Options for School Districts

It was within the role of a technical assistance provider seeking to bring the innovation of bilingual education to a school district that the Education Assistance Project worked to fulfill its principal on-site tasks: assessing the services offered to limited English proficient students by the two selected school districts and then recommending changes to improve or expand those services. Although real differences exist among school districts, the Project sought to generalize its findings for the benefit of other school districts, and most important, for the benefit of those involved in providing bilingual education technical assistance.

To produce a sufficiently broad plan, the technical assistance provider will want to address program design, consider the problems of teachers and training, and examine the issues of evaluation. Because of our view that programs must vary according to local needs and realities, we report on a broad number of possible approaches. At the same time, we include our perception of the weaknesses and strengths of particular choices.

PROGRAM DESIGN

The program design should seek to head off fragmentation. There is a natural tendency for bilingual education to exist on the edge of the school—disconnected from what the "regular" students and teachers are doing. This tendency must be fought both for the benefit of the students in the program and for the survival of the program itself. In particular, the curriculum in the program should be related to the mainstream curriculum. This does not mean, for example, that English readers must be used according to the designated grade level; on the contrary, such readers should be introduced only when oral progress in English has laid the appropriate groundwork. But in such content areas as science, students must be kept up to grade level in the language they understand so that when they are ready to leave the bilingual program, they are also ready to pick up the regular course work.

It is vital that the program be planned for the entire district and that it enunciate clear goals. The plan should describe precisely what is to be taught, to which students it is to be taught, and when they will be taught it. Standards should be set for when to promote students and when to move them out of the program and back to the regular classroom.

Bilingual programs cannot limit their emphasis to the student's language—native and second. The traditional content areas must also be offered on the same basis that they are offered to other students (except for the language of instruction). Bilingual program students must be exposed to all areas of the curriculum at a pace and in a sequence that are carefully coordinated with what is being offered in the English curriculum. Before a child is ready to exit from a bilingual class to an all-English program, there should be a careful examination of the student's records to insure that both linguistically and academically the student will have a good chance for success.

District-Wide Policy for Bilingual Education

Many school districts lack a policy that specifies goals for the bilingual program and how those goals are to be achieved. This lack means that there are often no coordinating efforts between bilingual and regular education programs; even within bilingual programs there are usually only minimal efforts to coordinate the native-language and English-language components. The failure to coordinate has consequences in all areas affecting instruction,

and so any effort to create a district-wide policy must begin by finding answers to basic questions in every area.

1 *Goals Clarification*—What are the agreed upon goals for the bilingual program? Is there a general understanding about the program in terms of these goals?
2 *Student Referral Procedure*—Who are the students who should receive bilingual instruction? How should these students be identified?
3 *Curriculum Scope and Sequence*—What is to be taught in the bilingual program and at what grade levels should it be covered?
4 *Promotion and Retention Policies*—How will achievement be measured in bilingual classes? What criteria will be used to determine promotion and retention?
5 *Exiting Criteria*—How will it be determined that students for whom bilingual programs have been mandated are no longer in need of these services?

The Project found an almost total absence of policy respecting bilingual education in one district and some policy gaps in the other. In the first district, a maintenance bilingual model had been rejected, but no policy was articulated concerning the point at which students would be shifted into the regular English program. A major pitfall for this district was its failure to enlist the assistance of the regular curriculum development staff. The bilingual program staff were not knowledgeable in the regular curriculum, and the regular curriculum developers were not involved in any meaningful way in the bilingual program. Consequently, the bilingual program was not coordinated with the district's overall program.

In the second district, detailed policy had been articulated for language assessment and curriculum. But no policy existed in many other areas—oral language development, ESL, grouping of students, and the role of principals in the program. These areas were, not coincidentally, among the school system's weakest. Nor did this district—which claimed to have a transitional bilingual education program but was philosophically committed in some respects to a maintenance bilingual education program—articulate a policy of when students were to be moved out of the program. Because bilingual programs are often controversial and complex in comparison to most other programs, a detailed set of policies, endorsed by the administration, and thoroughly understood by district staff, is a necessity. This means making hard decisions from the outset. Delaying such decisions means delaying or destroying program effectiveness.

A task force consisting of line and staff administration, bilingual and regular subject area specialists—particularly in the areas of reading, language arts, and mathematics—should be assembled to study and make recommendations concerning the five problem areas listed. Once recommendations are agreed upon, they should be written down and disseminated to principals and teachers. In-service training should be held centrally and at individual campuses to insure that there is a thorough understanding of the

program and of the guidelines to be followed to implement it effectively in the district.

Once the five questions have been answered, the following points should be considered:

1 *Goals Clarification*—If the goals for the bilingual program are **compensatory or transitional**, the district policy should specify that the native language of the student will be used as a vehicle for instruction only until the student is able to benefit from an all-English instructional program. At that time, native language instruction will cease, and the student will join the mainstream English classroom. On the other hand, the district may want to support a **maintenance** bilingual program. In this case the ultimate goals for the program will be the development of a fully bilingual student—a student who is literate in both the native language and English. Native language arts development should therefore continue along with English language arts development. Finally, a district may wish to support an **enrichment** bilingual program in which English-speaking students will become fluent in a second language while non-English-speaking students learn English. In this case, the goals of the program will be to produce a total student population that is bilingual and biliterate.

2 *Student Referral Procedures*—Once the goals of the bilingual program are determined, criteria and procedures should be specified describing those students who are to receive bilingual instruction. These procedures, while they must be consistent with existing legal guidelines, should also reflect community wishes and available resources. Although a maintenance or enrichment program might be desirable, for example, it is probably not feasible if an insufficient number of bilingual teachers are available.

Not only must the academic and linguistic abilities of each student be evaluated, but procedures must be set up to determine who will do the evaluation, what records are to be kept, and how this process can be facilitated with the least disruption to the classroom teacher. In one district observed, for instance, the teachers resented the amount of paper work and record-keeping involved in the evaluation process. Records are important, but obviously a balance must be maintained.

3 *Curriculum Scope and Sequence*—The curriculum for all major subjects at all grade levels specifies what is to be taught and the sequence in which it is to be taught. Once a bilingual program is introduced to the school district, care must be taken that bilingual curriculum areas parallel, where appropriate, the scope and sequence of the regular curriculum. School districts must have *the same* achievement expectations for students in bilingual programs as for students in the regular education program.

4 *Promotion and Retention Policies*—Most school systems have established written policies concerning procedures for determining when students

will be promoted to the next grade level or when they will be retained. Such policies usually place heavy emphasis on reading and mathematics achievement, grades, and/or standardized tests. All of these are based on performance in English. When a bilingual program is implemented in a system, some adjustments must be made in these policies to allow for students who do not speak English. If a student in a bilingual program is making satisfactory progress in subject areas in the native language, he or she should be promoted to the next grade level even though a comparable rate of progress is not being made in English.

5 *Exiting Criteria*—If the school district is implementing a bilingual program that provides native language instruction only until the student can participate effectively in the all-English curriculum, specific procedures must be established for determining the point at which the student can leave the bilingual program. Such procedures should take into account the student's achievement in the native language, English reading level, and content area achievement in English.

Fragmentation of Programs

There are a number of problems that relate to one or more of these areas but need to be considered separately. One of the most common is fragmentation. When externally funded programs are sought to meet the mandate of providing bilingual education, they frequently become add-on programs rather than integral parts of the total curriculum. The result is that while instruction continues as usual for the total school population, those children identified for bilingual instruction are placed in an isolated bilingual program with separate teachers, materials, and administrative structures. This fragmentation isolates both teachers and students from the resources and support system of the district as a whole. The implications are significant. Personnel resources—such as math, science, and social studies curriculum specialists for the entire district—do not participate in development of curriculum for the bilingual program. As a consequence, the bilingual curriculum is often not synchronized with the district-wide curriculum. The program and children are stigmatized. The teacher is stigmatized. The burden of accountability for the progress of limited English proficient students is placed solely in the hands of the bilingual teacher. This is an unrealistic burden of responsibility not placed on other teachers. Moreover, reporting lines for bilingual teachers are often conflicting in that most teachers are directly accountable to their principals, whereas bilingual teachers may be accountable to the bilingual program director. This not only removes the principal from direct responsibility for the success of the bilingual program, but also separates a bilingual teacher from any significant participation in the ongoing team effort of the school.

Fragmentation can be minimized, if not avoided, if the curriculum scope and sequence of the bilingual program are coordinated with that of the regular English language program in the major subject areas. Children in the bilingual program can be exposed to a parallel sequence of objectives at the same time

as their English-speaking peers in other classrooms. The major difference, of course, is that the majority of these objectives will be covered in the child's native language. As children are introduced to more instruction in English, they will be able to make the adjustment more smoothly if they sense the continuity between both programs. In sum, the district's policies and guidelines covering bilingual programs should support the philosophy that expectations at each grade level, for children in the bilingual program, are similar to those for the district.

Language Arts Instructional Program

Another critical problem associated with the implementation of bilingual programs concerns the frequently inappropriate requirement that students with limited English proficiency use English readers. The reason is that many educators continue to see a complete separation between what occurs in the Bilingual Language Arts Instructional Program and the English Language Arts Instructional Program. Even though it may have been decided that these students should learn the beginning skills of reading (sometimes called decoding) in the language they speak, pressure is exerted to have them "catch up" to their grade level English equivalent. Consequently they are being confronted with an English reader before they have sufficient knowledge of the English language to succeed in these books. Without the background to read in English, students will most likely be unsuccessful and may become candidates for remedial programs.

This pattern ignores some basic learning tenets. Elementary school educators *know* that language arts programs offer a sequence of listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills, in that order. They accept the use of language arts textbooks, basal readers, and curriculum guides that traditionally support this development sequence. That is, children learn to speak a particular language before they learn to read in that language. In most languages the sequence is the same. However, many administrators and teachers have ignored what they know about the development sequences for language arts the moment bilingual programs are introduced to the school system.

A fully trained bilingual teacher understands the language arts developmental sequence in the native language as well as in English, the students' second language. The bilingual teacher realizes that in a bilingual program children are introduced to reading in their native language only after appropriate listening and speaking skills have been developed in that language. It is often at this point that children are just beginning to learn to listen and speak in English as well. They are learning English words and sentence patterns that express concepts they have already learned in their native language. Thus, reading in English should not be introduced until two further levels are reached: when native language reading skills and English oral language skills have been acquired.

The point at which English reading is introduced is often referred to as the

point of transition. It is critical that bilingual as well as regular education staff understand this issue of transition since it undergirds the basic philosophy of bilingual education. To repeat, **a student learns to read best when he learns in a language that he understands.** Once a student learns to read in his own language, that process can be transferred to a second or third language—but only after learning to speak the second or third language. Misunderstanding this concept often leads to programming decisions that are not in the best interest of the student and that create subsequent problems for the school program.

No first grade teacher in an all-English program would give students a third grade reader before they have learned the sounds of the letters of the alphabet. Similarly, with a basic knowledge of bilingual methodologies, no teacher should think of giving a third grade limited English proficient student a third grade English reader before the student is able (a) to read in the native language and (b) to speak enough English to understand what he is reading.

Entry and Exit Criteria

There are other problems with exiting—and entry—procedures in bilingual programs. These include failure to assign children to bilingual programs when instruments show they are in need of them and assignment of children to bilingual programs when they are not in need of them, as well as continued placement of children in bilingual programs when they are ready to be moved out and premature exiting of children who continue to need the bilingual programs.

The failure to include children in the program can be, in part, a function of nonexistent or unclear goals for the program. Other reasons are a lack of interest on the part of the system in providing adequate services, or systematic efforts to undercut the continued existence of the bilingual program. Initial or overlong placement of children who are English proficient in bilingual programs is also, in part, a function of unclear program goals and a disinterest on the part of the system in monitoring programs adequately. In addition, there may be an effort on the part of bilingual advocates to convert a transitional program into a maintenance one. Premature or delayed moving of children out of bilingual programs is often a result of the absence of any procedures for determining when students should leave the program.

The development of clearly defined goals for the bilingual program and guidelines for achieving these goals should help alleviate most of these problems.

Content Areas

A somewhat related problem emerges when it is time to place a bilingual

program student in the mainstream classroom. After students master the English speaking/reading process, they often arrive in the regular classroom only to find that their English skills are sufficient for understanding what is happening in the classroom, but there is a critical gap in their knowledge of subject content. For example, sometime around the middle of the third grade, students are usually introduced to number fractions. However, they must have an understanding of addition and subtraction facts before being introduced to this new concept. Most third graders are expected to have had this background. This is not always true, however, of the students who have come across from bilingual classrooms. Similar lags are frequently found in science, history, and language arts.

We close our discussion of program design by touching again on a point raised earlier, that of voluntarism. Ideally, a bilingual program should be introduced for pedagogical reasons rather than legal reasons. Unfortunately, this is rarely the case. Nonetheless, district administrators, in dealing with their staff and communities, can work to detoxify the political context in which many programs emerge by stressing the pedagogical rationale behind the program—the focus on increased achievement for limited English proficiency students. This focus can be reinforced by developing a broad, district-wide program of services with clear implementation guidelines, thereby removing as much ambiguity as possible about how the program is supposed to operate, who is supposed to be in it, and why.

Any new program is doomed to failure if the acknowledged school administration takes a passive role in its implementation. Support and concern for bilingual programs must be seen to be emanating from the superintendent down to all levels of administration. In communicating about the program to the community and school staff, every effort should be made to be positive and to stress improved student achievement as the goal. Ultimately, no principal or teacher wants to see his or her students fail. There may be disagreement about the means to be used in achieving success, but there is little disagreement about the desirable end products—a rise in educational achievement.

TEACHERS AND TRAINING

The most important group with whom technical assistance providers must work to achieve change is, of course, teachers. The problem areas likely to be encountered fall under two categories, first the shortage of adequate staff and other resources, and second the difficulties of structuring the necessary training and retraining.

The shortage of trained bilingual education teachers means that the typical program will have to use teachers who are bilingual but inexperienced in elementary (or secondary) level instruction or vice versa. Techniques for stretching thin teacher resources while recruitment efforts proceed include using bilingual teaching aides, pairing a monolingual and bilingual teacher, or having a bilingual center where students can be sent for special instruction.

The training of teachers in bilingual programs should not be of the lighthouse variety nor should it be prepackaged. Rather, it should be designed from the bottom up to meet real teacher needs, and it should be interactive—featuring such techniques as classroom demonstrations, classroom visits, problem-solving workshops, and how-to-do-it presentations. This emphasis on the concrete should predominate, but the training must also impart a full understanding of the program's goals, philosophy, and conceptual underpinnings. Moreover, at least some bilingual training—particularly on the program's philosophical bases—should be given to all teachers in the district so that the goals of the program, often misconstrued, will be widely understood. Finally, the bilingual training should be conceived as part of, not separate from, the district's general training programs—again to combat the program's isolation from the rest of the school district.

Appropriate Bilingual Staff

The critical shortage of qualified bilingual personnel normally creates a temporary threshold barrier to the effective implementation of necessary bilingual programs. Districts will not usually have enough qualified bilingual staff (certified where required) to serve all children in need. Bilingual teachers not only need to have appropriate language skills, they must also be fully qualified to teach in the specific grade levels and content areas to which they are assigned. All too often, school districts "make do" by assigning secondary foreign language teachers to elementary bilingual programs. These teachers, while perhaps able to communicate in the language of the students, are handicapped in their attempt to teach the necessary

developmental skills because they lack an appropriate background in elementary teaching methods. In other cases, teachers who are native speakers of, say, Spanish or Chinese are assigned to elementary bilingual programs, although they are only certified in other areas (music, physical education, science). Again, without appropriate bilingual education training, these teachers are performing outside the area of their expertise and therefore are incapable of meeting their students' needs fully.

To begin, a language survey of all teachers in the district should be conducted to determine the availability of bilingual resource staff. If bilingual expertise is available in the school district, as is sometimes the case, initial steps can be taken to determine if these teachers are willing to transfer to bilingual assignments. Plans must also be made to examine these teachers' skills in order to train them in bilingual methodology. The district should initiate aggressive recruitment campaigns for bilingual staff. Institutions of higher education can help in identifying their graduating bilingual certified teachers.

School districts can extend the use of their present teaching staff by experimenting with alternative staffing patterns, such as teaming a bilingual teacher with a monolingual teacher, or establishing bilingual centers where monolingual teachers send students for native language instruction. In this way, a qualified bilingual teacher assumes responsibility for native language instruction of students from different classrooms, while the sending teachers (the monolingual teachers) assume responsibility for English instruction.

School districts can determine those teachers (bilingual and monolingual), who would be willing to take additional coursework in bilingual methodology in an effort to qualify for a bilingual assignment. This is not a short-term solution, of course. As an interim measure, bilingual teacher aides could be hired to provide language assistance for students in conjunction with a monolingual teacher.

Many school districts that must implement bilingual programs have in their neighborhoods a potential resource bank of bilingual people who can be recruited and encouraged to return to school for their teaching certification. Many might be willing to work parttime as bilingual aides while taking coursework at night or in the summers, especially if a district were willing to pay all or part of their tuition. Since most of these recruits would have a vested interest in their schools and communities they would be more likely to remain permanently with the district.

Finally, for the relatively long range, Future Bilingual Teachers Clubs can be started at the high school level. The clubs encourage high school students to go on to the university and take courses leading to a bilingual teacher degree. School districts can contract with universities to provide those courses necessary for bilingual certification at a campus convenient to their teachers. A flexible teaching schedule should be arranged so that more teachers would enroll. Many teachers are willing to take additional courses if they can do so immediately after school rather than disrupting their evenings.

Appropriate English-As-A-Second-Language Staff

In addition to providing for appropriate bilingual staff, districts implementing bilingual programs are finding that their regular staff is ill-equipped to teach English to speakers of other languages. Even though a school district may have teachers who are bilingual and can teach in two languages, many of these teachers may not be trained to teach students a second language—English. In one school district, for example, the Project found no one with any extensive, formal training in teaching English-as-a-Second-Language. As a result, the ESL component of the bilingual program received little attention. Those classes that were supposed to be ESL classes were either conducted mostly in the students' first language or were remedial English reading classes with little oral language instruction.

When teachers responsible for ESL instruction have no training other than in teaching developmental reading and language arts to native speakers of English, the results are all too predictable. Limited English proficiency students, although they may be receiving assistance in their native language, are usually tracked toward an all-English curriculum, to be placed into a mainstream English instructional situation. Without any special assistance in learning English, they will fall behind before they have had a chance to learn English adequately.

Because ESL is a component of all bilingual programs, and because most districts will have a shortage of bilingual teachers, training must be provided for the teachers in ESL methodologies. These include primary language development, second language acquisition, analysis of the contrasts between English and the students' first language, and developmental and remedial reading techniques.

It should be determined what courses are being offered in ESL at local universities, and the information should be made available to principals and teachers to encourage their participation. School districts might also contract with local universities to provide a series of after-school or Saturday in-service courses in ESL methodology. Key personnel in each school (reading teachers, grade level chairpersons, resource room teachers) could be assigned to participate in these courses and subsequently train other teachers.

Bilingual Materials

Bilingual programs naturally require an array of bilingual materials in various target languages, in appropriate content areas, and at all necessary grade levels. Although in recent years there has been marked development and availability of bilingual materials, particularly in Spanish, those available still cover only a limited range of grade levels and subjects. For other language groups, even where the number of students is substantial, appropriate materials are in short supply.

Although the development and dissemination of native language bilingual

materials has lagged far behind the development of English instructional materials, federal funding has subsidized some bilingual curriculum development. Resource centers and materials dissemination centers are located throughout the country to provide, upon request, information related to available materials. In most cases, existing materials have been analyzed in terms of grade level, content, scope and sequence, suggestions for use, price, and availability. Two major resources for information about bilingual materials are the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education in Rosslyn, Virginia and the Office of Bilingual Educational and Minority Language Affairs in Washington, D.C.

If districts find that materials are unavailable in their target languages or inappropriate for their needs, they can begin the development of their own materials. However, one caution is necessary. Curriculum development is a full-time undertaking. Teaching staff should not be expected to implement a program at the same time that they are developing the curriculum. Specific staff should be hired, on an interim basis, to direct and implement the development of materials for classroom use.

In-Service Training

Of the various short- to long-term solutions for building a group of qualified persons, the one in which districts are most likely to be interested and themselves involved is in-service—that is, training teachers within the school district through district-sponsored training programs. There are a variety of problems to be avoided and minimized in establishing and running such programs.

One major pitfall for many in-service programs in bilingual education is that the training does not meet teachers' preferences for concrete, program-specific, practical instruction. General lectures of the inspirational format do not satisfy either the needs of the faculty or of the students. The preference is for training that is sequential and takes a step-by-step how-to-do-it approach. It should be grade- and content-specific. This concern was repeated by teachers time and again in both districts the EAP members observed. Teachers of bilingual education classes are faced with increased demands on their time resulting from heterogeneous classes and small-group instruction, in two languages, requiring the preparation of multiple lesson plans; they need and are attracted to training that will alleviate their daily burden, not add to it.

Recognizing the need for intensive training, districts nevertheless tend to rely on one-shot pre-service training sessions, which prevent teachers from making effective use of training. Teachers must be given the opportunity to interact with one another in a work situation rather than in a "lighthouse" dissemination strategy session.

Frequently, districts will fix on a particular in-service instructional approach and not vary from it. There is a need to design in-service instruction appro-

priate to the skill or knowledge required: the forms it takes include classroom demonstration, classroom visits, peer problem-solving, workshops, institutes, and how-to-do-it lectures. Usually, a combination of approaches is most effective.

Training must respond to requests from the teachers. A "bottom-up" approach is essential. Too many in-service programs are prepackaged and fail to address the particular concerns of a district's staff. These concerns can be identified through a questionnaire designed to ascertain teacher's needs, by conversation with key personnel, by a review of in-service programs previously given, and by contact with other trainers having some familiarity and experience with the district. Similarly, it is valuable to know the variety of levels of experience and skill among the faculty so that the training can reflect those different levels. A background profile on the bilingual teachers is helpful here.

There are cerain areas where good training will have to go beyond teachers' demands for concrete, practical instruction. These include the reasons behind the goals, objectives, and philosophy of bilingual education or ESL; the rationale underlying the language assessment process; the principles supporting specific aspects of ESL instruction; the justifications for oral language development preceding the introduction of reading; or the conceptual underpinnings for including a cultural component in a bilingual program. All of these require that the teacher have some understanding of more generalized concepts. How to best deliver these concepts, these matters of "philosophy," these more broadly based rationales—without becoming "too theoretical"—is the sort of problem that those providing technical assistance will have to work to solve in each individual situation. One key to representing these more general or philosophical concepts is to relate them in a manner and a medium that ties them to the day-to-day problems a teacher will face.

There is little question that there are such ties. In both school districts with which the EAP worked, the bilingual teachers reported that they felt a sense of estrangement and even hostility from their fellow teachers. In one district the ESL teachers complained of a lack of understanding for their own concerns and of the special problems they confronted. The bilingual or ESL teachers' thorough and confident understanding of the principles and rationales of bilingual education and second language acquisition would aid them in overcoming this estrangement and breaking through the hostility. All too often bilingual teachers are unable to articulate the teaching justifications for bilingual education.

Similarly, all teachers generally recognize the significance of parental support and involvement in the education of their children. Skeptical or inquiring parents can be made more supportive if the bilingual teachers can communicate to them the goals, objectives, and philosophy of bilingual education or ESL. Surely, this is true when discussing unfamiliar areas such as relating oral language development in English to reading in the first language. The past schooling experience of parents frequently provides no background

to help them comprehend such concepts. Likewise, if a bilingual teacher understands the "theory" underlying the inclusion of a cultural component in bilingual programs, the classroom environment can be more creatively developed.

Teacher estrangement as well as other problems can be minimized by coordinated training. Bilingual teacher training should be an integral part of the district-wide training plan, treated as a part of—not an appendage to—the training programs for the entire district.

Although some aspects of bilingual education teacher training are appropriate specifically for bilingual staff alone, many areas of training are proper for all teachers. For instance, a math in-service workshop on introducing fractions is as appropriate for bilingual teachers as for monolingual teachers. In one of the districts observed by the EAP, the fledgling bilingual program functioned as a fifth wheel. There was virtually no recognition, unfortunately, that bilingual teachers should benefit from additional teacher training programs designed for the monolingual staff. One obstacle to coordination in the past has been that many bilingual programs receive funds under specific statutes (e.g., Title VII, Title I, Migrant) that limit participation to staff with particular assignments. For example, if a teacher is involved in a program supported only by Title I, he or she often is not permitted to attend a Title VII in-service session, even though the Title I teacher instructs limited-English students just as the Title VII teacher does. Determining who is invited to participate based on funding rather than teaching responsibilities results in duplicative in-service training and prevents cohesion of the district's program. To the extent permissible, districts should coordinate the use of the in-service funds provided under separate statutes so that all faculty in need of in-service training receive it. The district will then be better able to capitalize on its training funds and to enhance rather than impede coordination. It is imperative that in-service training be specific to function and not to funding. Separate training programs also usually mean the appointment of several program directors. Neither of the districts observed by the EAP had designated a single director of in-service training who could coordinate the planning and scheduling of in-service training for bilingual and ESL teachers. Yet such a central official can be vital, particularly when he or she has the authority and experience to avoid both nondirected training and directed repetitive training. In addition, with a single director, the district can review its overall resources (fiscal, teacher time, and expertise) and establish a coordinated schedule that reflects these resources, as well as needs.

Who Devises and Provides It

But the single, strong director can also create difficulties. Exclusively "top-down" in-service training programs cannot develop a feeling among the faculty of ownership of the in-service program. Nor are these programs likely to respond to the reality and the daily needs of teachers in their classrooms. Teachers usually know whether they have been well prepared to

do what they are being asked to do. Principals or central administrative staff charged with in-service training are often unfamiliar with the objectives and content of bilingual and ESL programs.

As a result, the purposes served may not be the right ones. Too frequently in-service training is less a useful exercise for staff than an "event" to satisfy funding sources and to show good faith support for the bilingual program. And there can be damaging insensitivity in seemingly small matters. In one of the districts, the EAP found that such in-service events were scheduled when the teachers returned from summer vacation and before the first day of the new term, a time when teachers were anxious to set up their class programs: Teachers resented the use of this time for training. From the administrative point of view, however, the advantage of such scheduling was to get the training "out of the way." This divergence of interests does not mean that administrative personnel should not participate in in-service design. But those who do should be chosen for their skills, not their status or rank. Substantive expertise may, of course, exist at the "top" as well, in which case central staff should be included in actual training.

The lack of a knowledgeable administration has many costs. Those providing in-service training who have insufficient practical experience in bilingual classrooms are more apt to present less practical, less solution-oriented, and therefore, less relevant training. Local talent is frequently underutilized in the training programs. Methods of successful teachers or appropriate locally developed instructional materials, or both, are not disseminated, and in-service training rarely provides a mechanism to facilitate feedback from teachers or aides; they are rarely invited to raise issues of concern as they occur in the classroom. In that connection, it is important to underscore that training should involve two-way communication. Too often, teachers are forced to sit silently as they are lectured to by a person with no familiarity with the district and its faculty's specific needs and circumstances.

A word of caution about the bottom-up input to teacher training. Teachers, themselves, frequently see issues from a very limited perspective. Their recommendations often embrace more aid, fewer students, and greater planning time. But by appropriate use of teachers, administrators, and specialists, one can create the best planning forum. The administrators and the specialists can describe district expectations, policies, and procedures. Teachers can have a say in the training they will need to accomplish those expectations, to carry out the policies, and to follow the procedures. Together, a training format can be designed around the personnel, money, and staff relations that all participants acknowledge.

Technical assistance from outside can be useful in presenting a district with options to consider in meeting its needs to provide a better program. But, in the districts the EAP worked with, teachers complained that the providers of the outside technical assistance had no specific knowledge of the curriculum materials used, the range of experience of the teachers, or the prior in-service training programs to which the teachers had been exposed. The message clearly was that outside resources must operate in tandem with people inside the district to make the options feasible.

Who Participates in It

Bilingual programs are commonly viewed and treated as the district's stepchild. And in-service training related to language minority students often exacerbates this feeling of being an "add-on" service by being limited to bilingual teachers. We have spoken earlier about ways to ease that separateness, including the appointment of administrative personnel who are familiar with bilingual programs and setting bilingual goals that are coordinated with the district's overall educational objectives. Opening the training sessions of bilingual staff to other teaching faculty is also required.

In-service training must embrace those staff members directly involved in the bilingual program (including aides, who are often mistakenly left out). And it must embrace those staff members who are not. Of course, the degree of participation of those who are not directly involved in the bilingual program should differ from those who are directly involved. But without this integration, the content, goals, and philosophy of the bilingual program will be unrelated to those of the district as a whole. "Regular" teachers must have an understanding of the students' activities in the bilingual program, for the students will be enrolled during part of their school day in the regular teachers' classes. Finally, integrating the faculty will tend to demystify the bilingual program, build greater understanding of its purposes and needs, and promote a greater connection to the program by the overall district staff.

Implementation Concerns

To provide training that will be immediately helpful to teachers, the in-service training programs must be related to the curriculum materials and to the specific goals and objectives of the district. Training should extend into the classroom. As previously suggested, this has implications for the use of technical assistance persons. Specialists in the district or outside consultants should be able to come into classrooms, demonstrate techniques, observe lessons, and offer constructive feedback and suggestions.

To avoid overloading teachers and to most easily permit aides to participate in in-service training, the formal training program should take place, to the extent possible, in prep time or release time on a mandatory basis. This suggestion surely raises concerns involving collective bargaining agreements, early release of students, disruption of parents' work schedules, and possible loss of some state funding revenue. Even if the amount of release time would not be sufficient for all the needed training, the greatest amount of release time possible should be tapped.

No doubt, however, some training during unpaid hours will be necessary. Although few relish more work for the same pay, teachers might be willing to attend on a voluntary basis on certain weekends, if practical, how-to in-service training were offered. Another incentive may be the cachet of a "status symbol," such as selecting exemplary teachers to give in-service training or using curriculum materials developed by such teachers throughout the school or the district. But the most important incentive is the final

pay-off. If in the long run the in-service training saves the teacher time and effort, and in fact makes the job of teaching more rewarding, teachers will want to volunteer.

Teachers Must Teach Themselves

Many school districts have experienced and competent bilingual teachers. They are, however, rarely used to train their less experienced colleagues. Districts should look within their own ranks to identify these exemplary teachers, recognize their outstanding skills, and make use of them to improve the level of teaching in every school in the district. The teachers' reward may be simply recognition by the district. Exemplary teachers may serve as models; other teachers within the school can observe them teach on a release time basis. Periodic meetings—some at lunch—can be arranged to discuss particular teaching problems, such as how to use new materials or ways of attending to individual pupil needs. These sessions can be coordinated among the schools and with the in-servicing that takes place on a district-wide basis. Videotaping exemplary teachers and then sharing those videotapes with schools throughout the district is another way of increasing knowledge of effective practices.

To further the sense that the program reflects the views and needs of teachers, faculty meetings can be turned into brain-storming sessions to discuss and recommend solutions to identified problems. These sessions may take place on a school-by-school basis or, less frequently, on a district-wide basis. Topics discussed can range from material selection to ways of grouping students within a class. Solutions developed in one school are often not communicated to other schools where similar solutions are appropriate. Accordingly, a network must be developed to disseminate, throughout the district, ideas generated by faculty. In sum, teacher training should include not only formal in-servicing, but faculty members working together informally or by providing them a framework to teach themselves.

Particular Areas To Be Considered

The Use of Materials. Unfamiliarity with instructional materials can be a problem at the outset. That is to say, when the materials are not locally developed, when they are introduced for the first time, they will, of course, be unfamiliar to the teacher. How to familiarize and help a teacher apply the new curriculum materials is a major concern in implementation. Frequent workshops will provide some clues, though they will not be sufficient. If master bilingual/ESL teachers are to be designated in each school, they can help. The bilingual or ESL coordinators might also be called upon, and their administrative roles reduced, so as to increase their availability to help with the application of curriculum materials. The same services might be provided by building administrators. In one of the districts the Project worked with, instructional materials were developed locally during summer recesses by teachers and administrators.

Language Consistency and Second Language Acquisition. Often, personnel teaching in bilingual programs switch from one language to another without reason. For example, during a session in English oral language development a teacher might switch back and forth from Spanish to English. In many communities language switching occurs in everyday situations, but it is not haphazard and uncontrolled. Students must be able to control their use of each language. Simply put, there may be situations in which language switching is appropriate, in which English only is appropriate, and in which the use of a first language only is appropriate. Students must learn to use languages to meet these varying situations. Accordingly, teachers must be conscious of their roles in modeling appropriate language behavior.

Sometimes there is not enough use of oral language. All too often, second language programs involve a teacher presiding over a classroom in which students read to themselves rather than learn the functional uses of spoken and written language. Teachers must be specially trained in techniques of direct teaching, in methods of eliciting oral responses from students in natural language interactions, and in techniques of developing listening skills.

Program Entry, Exit, and Transition. As noted in the section on program design, districts should develop policies on entry into and exit from bilingual programs, and on when students move (or make the transition) from first language reading to English reading. But faculty frequently do not comprehend the resulting selection of criteria, often including tests, which determine points of entry, exit, and transition. It is important for the bilingual staff to understand these policies—their rationale, impact, and mode of implementation. When a district selects a language assessment instrument, it is important that staff be helped to understand what the device can indicate and what it cannot; how to administer it; and how to use the results.

Grouping. Within a single classroom students have various degrees of skill in the subject taught. To respond to these differences, teachers will often group students according to these skill levels and will seek to provide as much individualized instruction as is manageable. For each group, the teacher must develop a lesson plan for the day's work. Too many groupings within a class can overload all but the most skilled and experienced teacher and prevent effective management and control of the class.

The risks become greater when the language skills of the children in their first language and in English are considered. Not only is the grouping premised on different skill levels but also on the ability to express those skills in two languages in each of the subject areas. To avoid over-grouping or inappropriate grouping, in-service training needs to be directed to the subject of how to group in a bilingual setting.

EVALUATION

Compared to program design and training, evaluation tends to have a low priority, but this is short-sighted. The four types of evaluation—needs assessment, ongoing process evaluation, summative evaluation, and secondary evaluation—can determine the effects of the program, gauge the progress of students, measure teaching skills, check the program's time-line, verify whether program goals are being met, and uncover needed changes. To be effective, an evaluator must first identify the audience that has an interest in the results, then formulate and negotiate the evaluation plan, next agree with the district on the type of information to be produced, and finally determine the costs.

The evaluation plan itself will involve a number of steps. An evaluation model must be selected—either a one-shot test, or longitudinal testing of the same students over a period of time, or the cross-sectional testing at one time of different but similar groups of students. Comparative standards must be set up through the use of a comparison group of similar students getting different special instruction, a control group of similar students getting no special assistance, or a statistical norm group. Appropriate sampling techniques may be desirable to avoid the costs of testing everyone in the program. Language assessment measures will be particularly difficult to employ because few exist. Another common problem is inconsistent or inconclusive evidence, and the evaluator must be careful not to miss unintended outcomes of the program.

The final concern for any technical assistance provider is that of evaluating how the program is working. Educational evaluation has become the focus of much attention during recent years. This coincides with the growing demand for accountability at all levels of education, from program initiation to implementation. It is clear, however, that despite its importance, evaluation remains little understood, much maligned, and often feared by teachers and administrators. The fact is that few individuals inside—or outside—the educational community look forward to being evaluated.

This situation is exacerbated in the case of bilingual education programs because they are controversial and are often viewed in a political rather than educational context. There are, for example, many commentators who contend that bilingual education must demonstrate student progress beyond that of other programs. Whether or not this is the case, the low priority ascribed to evaluation has limited the ability of the education community to assess the effectiveness of the various bilingual programs. This has perpetu-

ated the lack of information on the most effective methods for the education of children with limited English capabilities. Thus, the objective of this section of our report is to describe how to structure and take advantage of the evaluation function.

Potential Advantages and Problems

All too often, program evaluation is perceived as a way to weed out bad teachers or eliminate the program. Although the anxiety associated with evaluation is understandable, it is often unfounded. There are a number of valuable and potentially constructive outcomes of an evaluation effort. It can help to determine the short- and long-term effects of the bilingual program as well as short- and long-term student progress. It can assess teacher effectiveness, teacher training, and in-service activities. An evaluation can also determine whether the program time-line is being followed and goals are being met. And it can identify necessary program modifications—present and future—that would better meet the needs of students and teachers. Finally, it can be used to meet requirements of federal and state funding agencies, satisfy political demands, and serve public relations needs. This list is not exhaustive, but it does demonstrate that evaluation efforts have constructive functions to perform.

A review of the evaluation activities of a cross-section of school districts reveals that all school districts that receive federal and state funding are required to collect a multitude of data concerning program characteristics and student achievement. These data, which in some instances are extensive, are generally used only to examine pre- and post-scores in reading and mathematics or to determine program placement. Because the mechanics of the data base are already in place to satisfy the numerous requirements of the funding sources, it would be reasonable to use this information source to tell the district more about the programs, students, and personnel. The goal is to develop and implement a long-term evaluation component that will ensure that the limited fiscal resources of a school district are targeted on programs that effectively and efficiently meet student needs.

There are many real problems associated with evaluation, however. And despite the wide diversity of school districts across the country, many of the problems seem to be common to most districts. To begin with, evaluation is generally given a low priority in district funding and staffing. Second, the evaluator who is chosen is often associated with the program in some capacity, and thus is subject to allegations of self-interest and bias. On the other hand, using an evaluator who has little understanding of the program can result in conclusions about "paper" programs, which in no way resemble the programs in operation. And always there is the danger that the evidence on which the interpretation of results is based may be inconsistent and inconclusive. Other problems include a lack of attention to unintended outcomes of the program, limitations in the availability of assessment measures to

effectively determine student progress, and inadequate time after the program evaluation to make the recommended modifications. These difficulties—and the list is not all-inclusive—are not easily solved in the short term. But to design an evaluation program with the best chance of success, it is necessary to understand the process in some detail.

Types of Evaluation

Some think of evaluation as a one-shot effort to determine the overall effectiveness of a program, whereas in fact this is only one of several types of evaluation efforts. Many evaluation plans encompass more than one of these categories, and, indeed, the most comprehensive plans entail a cross-section of them. The four types are as follows:

1 *Needs Assessment*—This involves activities that occur before the implementation of a program. During this period, efforts are made to estimate the numbers of children with limited English proficiency in a particular district and to gather information about the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of these students. This is also the time to determine the operational feasibility of the proposed plan and the availability of financial and institutional support. The results should provide important guidance for program planning; both school districts served by the EAP conducted comprehensive needs assessments before the start of their bilingual programs. The better of the two programs was the one that more closely met the needs outlined in the initial assessment process.

2 *Process Evaluation*—This is the assessment of ongoing programs to determine when modifications are warranted. The activities to be continually reviewed include bilingual program management strategies, curricula, teacher training, community involvement, and so on. In some cases, formative or process evaluation may entail field testing a bilingual program on a small scale, a pilot test, before installing it more widely. Ideally, the plan for the formative evaluation is developed in conjunction with the development of the overall program. Unfortunately, some planners tend to shy away from this type of evaluation. One reason is what can happen in an attempt to modify an ongoing program, even if the changes will improve the delivery of services. If carefully implemented, however, a formative evaluation can make it possible to improve the project with minimal staff confusion and anxiety.

3 *Summative Evaluation*—This overall assessment of the program is meant to determine its effects on students, teachers, schools, and community. The principal challenge in this type of evaluation is the establishment of the appropriate indicators of success and ensuring that they are related to the program, rather than to other variables. For example, the results of a summative evaluation may indicate that the students in a particular bilingual class are making sizeable gains in English reading. The evaluator may mistakenly conclude that this success is attributable to the curriculum

when, in fact, the student gains in this class are the result of another variable—a highly skilled teacher who is bilingual. To avoid this sort of confusion, it is useful to have some knowledge of the **conditions**—like a skilled teacher—prior to the implementation of the program. A question to ask would be, how well did comparable students perform before the bilingual program was instituted?

4 *Secondary Evaluation*—These activities are generally associated with a re-examination of existing data. They are often stimulated by scholarly investigations into the subsequent effects of a program evaluation. For example, a teacher in one of the EAP districts was interested in the effects of second language acquisition on the learner's first language. Evaluations of this nature may take a variety of forms, ranging from re-analysis of original data (sometimes with different hypotheses), to professional critiques of evaluation reports and procedures. With the growing demand for evidence relevant to the efficacy of bilingual education, school districts are being encouraged to re-examine their student achievement data files to determine the long-term effects of programs.

How to Create an Effective Evaluation

Some or all of the above categories may be involved in an effective evaluation. But for any program, there are four specific steps that should be taken.

The first is to determine the various audiences who have an interest in the project. This will vary among school districts and clearly depends on the potential uses for the evaluation. The likely audiences include state and federal officials, local boards of education, project administrators, teachers, aides, and parents. The identification of each particular audience will help determine the specific areas to be included in the evaluation.

For example, state and federal officials may want answers to such questions as what are the effects of the bilingual program on student achievement in English and mathematics? Have there been significant changes in absenteeism and drop-out rates since the inception of the bilingual program? Does the program segregate children from the mainstream program? The local boards of education may want to focus on different factors, for instance: Is the bilingual program cost effective when compared to other approaches? Does the bilingual program meet federal and state requirements? For project administrators the questions of interest might be: Does the staff comprehend the goals and objectives of the bilingual program? Is the teaching staff sufficiently trained to implement a bilingual program? Are the curriculum materials appropriate and effective for students participating in the program? Teachers, aides, and parents might address the following issues: Are the students sufficiently prepared to study in English at their current grade level? What are the more effective classroom strategies for learning to read in the home language and English? What is the relationship between language test scores and actual school achievement? Does participation in the bilingual program lead to an

enhanced self-concept? What is the relationship between home language use and student language performance in school? Clearly, some of these questions are beyond the scope of any evaluation conducted at the local level. But the specific questions that the evaluation will address can be made more explicit when broken down and thought of in terms of the interest of the audiences.

The second step in planning an evaluation is the formulation and negotiation of an evaluation plan. Beforehand, the school district should have a clear understanding of what is to be done, how it is to be done, and why. This very much includes an awareness of the possible impediments to conducting the evaluation. For example, one of the EAP school districts wanted to compare the effects of bilingual education with those of ESL-only programs. But this was impractical because most of the limited English proficient students involved received one type of service to the exclusion of the other and that precluded control groups for comparison.

The formulation of an evaluation plan should also be based on the purposes and characteristics of the program. The wide diversity of bilingual projects makes a standardized evaluation plan impossible: rather, evaluation must be tailored to the specific program under study. Often, a program is labeled ineffective or non-cost-effective when, in fact, the program was never fully operationalized. This was the case in one of the EAP districts. There are, then, two distinct issues to consider: the success or failure of a district in implementing the program as it was originally conceived; and the effectiveness of the program as it was actually implemented. It is critical to understand the program under examination because conclusions are often drawn about "paper" programs that in no way resemble the program in operation. Some of the evaluations of Title VII projects indicate small student gains in reading English in the early grades. Many critics of the program are quick to point to these findings without considering that many of the students are making substantial gains in Spanish reading. They fail to note (and often the evaluations fail to note) that the students spend the majority of their reading time in Spanish. The intent is to develop reading skills in the home language before introducing reading in English. Therefore, it is not a sign of programmatic failure if these children do not show significant gains in English reading during the *early* stages of the program.

A third concern is the establishment of an agreement between the evaluator and the district on the type of information to be produced, its use, and the limits of the conclusions to be drawn from the study. This would include agreeing on the restrictions, if any, of access to the data and the results from an evaluation. In some cases, for example, issues raised by the Freedom of Information statutes must be examined along with, on the other hand, questions of confidentiality. In one district this question arose in connection with the determination of socioeconomic status. Numerous studies indicate the influence of this variable on student achievement. Even though this information can be extremely valuable in any evaluation of student achievement, one of the districts was unable to gather such data because of statutes that protect the students' right to privacy. Respect for and protection of the

rights and welfare of all parties to the evaluation should be an essential consideration in the negotiation process.

Issue four in the planning phase is the determination of evaluation costs. This is practically impossible until most of the evaluation components are specified. Even then it is often difficult to predict the time necessary to carry out a given task. According to several experienced evaluators, one principle that can be used is the "five percent rule of thumb." Once the overall program costs have been determined, five percent of the total is allocated to evaluation. This provides a helpful benchmark for determining the cost of an evaluation effort, although the size and design of the project should be taken into account.

Every effort should be made to take advantage of ongoing evaluation procedures in the school district. For example, most school districts have annual district-wide student testing programs. In addition, various entitlement or categorical aid programs are required to test students for program placement. Coordination of the bilingual education evaluation activities with other such efforts would not only reduce the costs but would facilitate an examination of the interrelated effects of multiple categorical aid programs.

In the end, whether the cost is five percent or is less, it may seem that the price of a solid evaluation is high, but it generally proves to be worth the effort in the long run, for a good evaluation can determine whether resources are well spent, whether students are profiting from the program, and—for those who must be concerned with the bottom line—whether it is cost effective.

Developing the Evaluation Design

After ascertaining the general issues that go into creating an effective evaluation, the evaluation planner is still left with the main task of putting together specific methods of evaluation to construct the particular program design. This stage of the evaluation process is necessarily influenced by statistical, fiscal, and political concerns. But special care must go into ensuring that the design is appropriate for the types of conclusions and inferences to be drawn from the study. For example, an evaluation of the impact of a bilingual classroom must consider "non-treatment," that is, how would the students have performed in the absence of the program being evaluated? Such a semi-hidden complication is far from the only one facing the planner. There are five areas of importance that must be carefully considered in developing an evaluation design: selection of the evaluation model, standards for comparison, sampling techniques, assessment measures, and data collection plan.

Selection of Evaluation Models. In general, there are three models used to assess academic performance: the "one-shot" model, the longitudinal model, and the cross-sectional model. The one-shot model simply measures the status of the students under study at a single point in time. For example, if all the fourth graders in all of the Los Angeles bilingual programs were given an English reading test, the average scores for each school could

be compared. The limitations of such a comparison for drawing inferences about the effectiveness of the program are evident. It assumes that each school has a comparable program and is working with students of equal ability, when in fact the students in the highest scoring school might have attained their reading proficiency skills no matter what school they attended. To assess growth, it is generally necessary to measure the achievement of students as they progress through different grade levels.

In a longitudinal study, repeated measurements are taken of the same subjects, usually over a considerable period. These types of studies are done when there is an interest in continuous monitoring of an ongoing program or in long-term program effects. For example, in bilingual programs there is often a delay of one or two years before the positive effects of the program are evident. Rather than attempting to reach any definitive conclusions prematurely, there is a growing body of research that emphasizes the need to assess student progress over a two- or three-year period.

Generally, longitudinal studies entail a pre- and post-test design. The pre-test provides information about the subjects before the program begins; the post-test assessment occurs at the end of the data-collection sequence. A question about post-tests that is given relatively little attention: How long before the students have been in the program should the post-test be given? Because the effects of bilingual programs may not be evident after the first year, it is generally useful to have an immediate and a delayed post-test before drawing any definitive conclusions about the program's effectiveness. For example, in some bilingual programs it has been found that students' reading scores in Spanish show significant gains during the first year. The reading-score gains in English, however, are not evident until the third or fourth years of the program. Thus, it is important to consider the sequencing of languages and the potential effect on student achievement before reaching any conclusions about the program.

The cross-sectional model is a compromise between the one-shot and the longitudinal approach. That is, a test is given not to the *same* students in grade 4 and then grade 5, but to the *current* students in these grades. The scores of the fourth graders are then used as proxy input scores for the fifth graders. The assumption is that no significant changes have occurred in the population served by the school program, so that the fourth grade students and the fifth grade students are comparable in socioeconomic status, language abilities, and so on. In other words, the present fourth graders are like their predecessors who are now in fifth grade. Cross-sectional studies, therefore, cannot assess *individual* student growth; *average scores for grades* can be used to obtain a general measure of growth brought by the program. Again, the use of such average scores can be more or less justified by the conditions of the particular school. If the population is stable and students do not drop out in significant numbers, the use of average scores for different grades may be justified.

Standards for Comparison. This issue is directly tied to two fundamental questions: Are there any noticeable effects attributable to the project? And if so, what is the degree of change attributable to the project?

The standard that enables the evaluator to answer involves the selection of a reference group of comparison students. Generally, in bilingual program evaluations a comparison group design is used. This consists of a class or group of students who are not involved in the bilingual project but who are otherwise comparable in linguistic, cultural, educational, and socioeconomic background. For example, a comparison group for recently arrived Vietnamese refugees who are participating in a primary school bilingual program would be a class of comparable refugees in another school in the district that receives only ESL training together with the teaching of content subjects in English. The main limitation of using a comparison group is the possibility of "contamination." This occurred in one of the districts where the successful methods and practices of a particular program (e.g., bilingual instructional techniques) were adapted by the comparison group teacher.

Another comparison standard that is frequently used is the statistical norm. Here information for comparative purposes is extracted from standardized test scores for national, state, or local school groups. The achievement results for the bilingual participants are compared with these selected norm groups to determine the effects of the program. Problems with this approach often arise because the norms are generally based on monolingual student populations, which are not comparable to the target group under evaluation. The issue of cultural and ethnic test bias also tends to limit the applicability of national norms for linguistic minority student populations. The success or failure of a particular program may not be apparent by comparing student performance only to national norms.

A third comparison standard involves the use of an experimental and control design. This entails the random assignment of comparable students to bilingual and monolingual classrooms to determine the effects of the educational treatment. This approach may provide some valuable program comparisons, but unfortunately it also violates the numerous legal mandates of the courts and federal government. In essence, these mandates require that children have the right to receive special educational services to ensure that they can function effectively in a regular English classroom. The mandates do not permit exceptions, do not permit that a control group can be denied the services, however helpful that might be for study purposes.

Whatever comparison standard is used, the most persistent problems for a comparative evaluation of bilingual programs are high student mobility rates and student transfer into the English-only program. For example, in one of the EAP sites, the district lost more than 50% of its original bilingual program participants during a given year. Therefore, it is important that the evaluation design account for length of participation in the program and actual attendance rates during each year of participation. Subsequent achievement data can be analyzed separately according to these factors.

The transfer of high achieving students into regular English programs can create a paradox—it leads to the elimination of data that provide support for the effectiveness of the program! Every effort should be made to include these students in the evaluation, even if they are no longer in the program when the data are analyzed. Inclusion may provide information about the

differences between successful and unsuccessful students who have participated in the program. These two groups of students (successful and unsuccessful) should be analyzed separately and together to determine the impact of the program.

Sampling Techniques. The number and type of students to be included in the evaluation have a critical impact in determining what sampling technique will work best. When the number of potential students to be assessed is large (more than 500), it is often necessary to consider a variety of sampling techniques. They will allow the evaluator to focus on a portion or sample of the entire set of participants. If the sample is carefully selected, the evaluator can draw conclusions about the entire group of students in the population.

The basic advantage of sampling is that it helps contain the costs of the evaluation effort. It is obviously much less expensive to collect and analyze 250 oral language test scores than 1,000. The time and cost saved may permit the inclusion of multiple indicators of language ability. This may entail a home language survey or a teacher evaluation of the students' oral language skills.

Any sampling procedure must consider, first, the number of students that has to be included in the sample to ensure the generalizability of the findings, and second, whether the sample adequately represents the various linguistic and cultural groups within the student population. The generalizability of any evaluation is affected by the sample size and design. It is crucial that the evaluator collect data from a sufficient number of students and/or programs before reaching any conclusions about the effectiveness of a particular treatment.

In addition, the heterogeneous nature of the bilingual student population means that each group must be identified by language and cultural background. One of the most common flaws in bilingual education evaluations is the grouping and analysis of very different students. Unless the evaluation details such differences, it may obfuscate the actual impact of the program.

Assessment Measures. This area is a weak link in the evaluation plans developed for bilingual programs. The principal reason for this is the lack of valid and reliable assessment measures to determine (a) student performance and (b) the degree of program implementation. Although theses two issues are related, they are most clearly discussed separately.

Student performance—Language dominance and language proficiency are the two categories to be measured. They are essential in the identification of students with limited English and in the assessment of existing language skills. Both measurements are necessary for student program placement. The past few years have witnessed the development of a number of oral language dominance and proficiency instruments for English and Spanish. There continues to be a paucity, however, of assessment instruments for skills other than those of oral language. And, for languages other than English and Spanish, almost no reliable and valid measures have been developed.

Tests that assess students with limited English proficiency need to be selected with considerable caution. It is important for a test to have adequate range for assessing the students' skill in a particular subject, i.e., mathematics, science, or language. The lower levels of performance—or the "floor"—measured should not be set too high so that low-achieving students are precluded from completing a portion of the test. Also, the upper limits or "ceiling" should be set so that high-achieving students are challenged by the test. Given the heterogeneity of the target population, it may be necessary to include test items that go beyond, both below and above, a specific grade level.

It is, of course, essential that the selected instruments are applicable for a particular program and that they are technically sound. If these criteria are met, achievement tests can provide more than mere discrete scores. Analyses of test items can determine which academic achievements have come at the student, classroom, or project level, and can be used for both diagnostic and prescriptive purposes.

Other nonformal test measures may be necesary to make up for the limitations in available instruments. These may include: ethnographic observations of students' classroom behavior to determine functional language skills and application of knowledge in subject matter; questionnaires or interviews to determine teacher, student, and/or parent assessments of student performance; relevant tasks (e.g., story telling) to determine student abilities in place of paper-and-pencil assessment measures. The lack of viable assessment measures has led numerous evaluators to use some combination of these procedures. As ethnographic analyses become more accessible to those outside the anthropological field, they may prove to be a useful assessment tool. For example, observation of students in a natural setting, such as during recess or in everyday community activities, may yield reliable information about real-life oral language ability.

Program implementation—Measuring the degree of implementation is complicated by the fact that the stated program goals, as we have said, often bear little resemblance to those of the actual program being evaluated. Moreover, assessment instruments developed for a program evaluation on the basis of stated goals sometimes are no longer appropriate for the curricula actually found in use in the classroom.

Those problems notwithstanding, a variety of techniques have been developed to determine the degree of program implementation. These include interviews with program staff, questionnaires, and classroom observations. The data collected in this phase of the evaluation can provide valuable insight for both the evaluator and the program staff. For example, an examination of the instructional strategies of the classroom can indicate the different uses of languages by the teacher. Does the teacher use English and the students' home language with equal frequency? Are the curricula and syllabus truly bilingual? Lack of such information can limit an evaluation, as it did in the evaluation conducted by the EAP.

In addition, information obtained about the program can identify conditions that lead to successful practices—conditions such as the status of teacher training, the relationship between the bilingual and the regular program, the type of curricular materials, degree of community involvement, commitment of local and state resources, and teacher-student ratios.

Finally, there are several indicators of program effectiveness that are often overlooked by evaluators. A reduction in absenteeism, decreases in grade-retention rates, lowered school drop-out rates, and increased participation in post-secondary education all point to a successful program. It may be difficult to get information concerning these indicators, but they are persuasive indices of program success when they are high.

Data Collection. This phase is critical to any evaluation. Even the most reasonable evaluation plan can be undermined by inexperienced or unsystematic data collection. Provisions should be made at the outset to select, train, and supervise competent staff to collect data. This was one of the biggest problems in the two EAP sites; given the absence of personnel with specific duties and expertise in data collection, the teachers generally had to assume this role. This is not ideal evaluation practice. Every effort must be made to ensure the comparability of data across classrooms and school programs. For example, if an oral language measure is to be used, all testers should be thoroughly trained and given the opportunity to conduct several trial measurements. They should be supervised by trained personnel to ensure that they will consistently use similar criteria in scoring student performance.

Care must be taken that the data collection activities cause minimal disruption of the program under study. Questions such as when, where, how, and from whom the data are to be collected must be thoroughly detailed in the evaluation plan.

The underlying concern is quality control of the data collection procedures. This is crucial if the effort is to be worthwhile and if the evaluation is to actually measure what it purports to measure.

Analysis and Interpretation of the Data

The final concerns in evaluation are the choice of analytical procedures and the art of interpretation. Like the choice of the data collection methods, the decision is generally dictated by the structure and design of the evaluation plan. It is during analysis that the evaluator examines the data for patterns and statistically significant relationships.

There are a variety of statistical procedures available to the evaluator. In choosing the appropriate tests and analyses of data it is first necessary to ascertain whether the assumptions underlying the selected statistical methods can be met. It is essential to review these assumptions to determine whether the available data fit them, and to propose alternative procedures if the criteria cannot be met. Also, the analysis of the data must include a statement regarding any limitations of the method. It is important to know what conclusions are justifiable from the evaluation results.

Of particular interest are the side effects or unintended outcomes of the program, as well as the intended outcomes specified at the onset of the evaluation. Often in this phase of the evaluation, the varying interests of evaluators, program administrators, and government officials intersect—and professional, financial, and political considerations are all at odds. Solving this problem often becomes as much an art form as an effort in scientific program evaluation.

Probably the most critical component in the evaluation process is that of interpreting the data. The conclusions to be drawn are often open to various nuances. The evidence on which the conclusions are formulated may be inconsistent. It is the responsibility of the evaluator to provide a variety of possible interpretations for whatever inconsistencies may exist.

The scope of the finished evaluation will depend on the needs of the particular school district. The evaluator must keep in focus the types of policy decisions that will be made concerning the program. For, in the last analysis, the evidence is not good or bad until it is viewed in relation to the purpose for which it will be used.

Changing Schools:
The Language Minority Student in the Eighties

Designed by Magna Ravenswater, Washington, D.C.
Composed by A&B Typesetters, Inc., Concord, New Hampshire
in Compugraphic Goudy
Printed by The McArdle Printing Company, Inc., Silver Spring, Maryland